



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to this terminology. Only the critic may be reminded that the appearance is *of* the extra-bodily object *to* the intra-bodily subject, and so itself a relation between existences, even if not an existential relation.

C. A. STRONG.

PARIS, FRANCE.

DISCUSSION

MR. MUSCIO'S CRITICISM OF MISS CALKINS'S REPLY TO THE REALIST

I HAVE just read with great interest Mr. Muscio's able and clearly written criticism¹ on my paper, "The Idealist to the Realist."² Muscio's statement, mainly in my own words, of my argument may be summarized as follows: "What is asserted is that the 'idealist *discovers* by examination of objects—he does not (as the realist accuses) *assume*—that both sense qualities and relations are mental.' Hence the question arises: What does Miss Calkins mean by 'mental'? The answer to this question is best seen from the treatment of sensible qualities. . . . The 'idealist' we are told, 'rests his case . . . on the *results* of direct observation coupled with the inability of any observer to make an unchallengeable assertion about sense qualities save in the terms of idealism. To be more explicit: The idealist demands that his opponent describe any immediately perceived sense object in such wise that his description can not be disputed. The realist describes an object as, let us say, yellow, rough, and cold. But somebody may deny the yellowness, the roughness, or the coldness; and this throws the realist back on what he directly observes, what he knows with incontrovertible and undeniable certainty, namely, that *he is at this moment having a complex experience* described by the terms yellowness, coldness, and the like (an experience which he does not give himself). This statement, and only this, nobody can challenge.' "

Mr. Muscio's criticisms are two:

I. It is impossible to "describe" sense qualities for they are elemental, incommunicable (p. 324).

II. Miss Calkins uses the term "mental" ambiguously, meaning by mental sometimes (1) the "incommunicable" (p. 324), sometimes (2) "that which is like me" (p. 325). Now, the sense-quality is in truth (1) incommunicable, but is not on this account "mental."

¹ This JOURNAL, Vol. IX., pages 321-327.

² *Ibid.*, VIII., pages 449-458. In the passage which follows, the sentences in single quotation marks are from this paper.

And (2) in the second and admissible sense of mental, yellow is not mental, that is to say, it is not true that yellow "thinks, feels, wills, acts" as I do (p. 325).

Upon these criticisms I have the following comment to make: I entirely agree with Mr. Muscio that it is impossible to describe a sense-element. But the quotation from my paper makes it clear that I apply the term "describe" to the sense-*object*, or sense-complex, not to the sense-quality. I speak of making assertions about qualities and of "describing" objects, or things, by enumeration of their qualities. Mr. Muscio's criticism is here based on a misreading of my statement. But this is a minor point and need not detain us.

Far more important is Mr. Muscio's distinction between (1) "mental" in the sense in which yellow may be called mental and (2) "mental" meaning "like me"—a difference which, as he rightly notes, my paper, "The Idealist to the Realist," ignores. My reason for leaving so important a distinction out of account was the fact that I was strictly limited to fifteen minutes in the delivery of the paper, and that it overran its predestined bounds in its published form. I offer this, however, as explanation, not as excuse, for Mr. Muscio's criticism more than half inclines me to believe that I might better have withheld a partial statement of my view. The present brief discussion is mainly an attempt to make good the former omission.

I agree with Mr. Muscio in the belief that the basal meaning of "mental" is "like me." To be mental is, ultimately, to be a self. The form of idealism which I uphold is, in other words, personal idealism,—the doctrine that the universe is constituted by inter-related selves, not phenomenalist idealism, the Humian doctrine that things and selves alike are resolvable into series of mental "contents," impressions, and ideas. In what sense then can I call "yellow" mental, since (as my critic rightly insists) yellow does not, like a self, "think" or "feel." I answer: yellow is mental in the subordinate sense of being an "aspect" or "partial experience" of a self. The only unchallengeable assertion about yellow is that it is a *way in which I, a self, am conscious*. Mr. Muscio accordingly mutilates reality when he says that yellow is mental only in the sense of being incommunicable. For yellow is not merely incommunicable: it is the incommunicable experience of a self. The conception is in truth through and through personal: the "communicated" is experience shared with and by a self, and the "uncommunicated" is that experience which a self does not share.

To summarize this reply to Mr. Muscio: I agree with him that the term "mental" is used in two senses in my paper, and (2) that a

sense quality is not mental in the sense of being a self. But I insist that a sense quality is mental, or ideal, in a genuinely idealistic sense, that is, as aspect or "content" of a self. Thus "yellow" is a certain experience which a self has (or which selves have); just as any relation (whether knowledge, or dependence, or influence) ultimately is a self-in-its-relating,—a self as knowing, depending, or acting. And again I ask Mr. Muscio and the other critics of idealism to make any other unchallengeable assertions about sense-qualities.

I realize that the "unchallengeableness" of these statements will not give pause to those neo-realists who regard the indisputableness of an assertion as a possibly insignificant character of it.³ This indifference to a self-evident truth is perhaps to be explained by the fact that the neo-realists, adhering as they do to the philosophy of "primordial common sense" (excepting only in their highly uncommon explanations of illusion), enter on the business of philosophy with a very respectable stock in trade of unchallenged (*not* of unchallengeable!) assumptions. But thinkers who have divested themselves of this hereditary capital and who have to make their way in the world of speculation without such helpful presuppositions as the "knower"⁴ and the "known world," with its "evident composition,"⁴ can not afford to throw away even insignificant certainties. They hold that however unimportant the unchallengeable in itself, the character of being unchallengeable is of utmost significance in the philosophical search for truth.

Of course, my argument in its present form has led only to a solipsistic type of personal idealism. The first stage of the argument against non-idealism does, in truth, lead to a temporarily solipsistic conclusion. The way out of solipsism, through a recognition of the implication of the passivity and receptiveness of my experience, I have indicated briefly in the article under discussion and more at length elsewhere.⁵

Mr. Muscio concludes his very temperately written article with the rather extravagant observation that "the hypothesis that the objects of knowledge are mental will have to find some definite, relevant, and logical support if it is to be more than a mere forgotten fantasy." The remark is the more surprising in that Mr. Muscio has just admitted that it "is doubtless true that 'realistic' writers have little positive doctrine." He defends the realist, however, as a "clearer away of much rubbish." Waiving the question whether or not the realist has yet, as a fact, cleared away the "rubbish" of

³ Cf. "The New Realism," 1912, pages 19–20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pages 34–35.

⁵ "The Persistent Problems of Philosophy," *passim*. Cf. p. 411.

idealism, I am loath to agree with Mr. Muscio's implication that demolition is all that may be demanded of philosophical thinkers..

MARY WHITON CALKINS.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE.

REVIEWS AND ABSTRACTS OF LITERATURE

The Treatment of Personality by Locke, Berkeley and Hume: A Study in the Interests of Ethical Theory of an Aspect of the Dialectic of English Empiricisms. JAY WILLIAM HUDSON. University of Missouri Studies. Philosophy and Education Series. Vol. I., No. 1.

Consideration of fundamental ethical conceptions leads Professor Hudson to look upon them as essentially predicates of personality. Used abstractly such terms lose their significance. Witness the many arguments concerning freedom. The true question at issue, it should always be borne in mind, is that of the free person. This personal reference of ethical conceptions points to the view that the logically validating ground of all such terms is to be found in a finally self-sustaining doctrine of the person. That is to say, ethics presupposes the reality of the ethical person. The true question that the moralist must answer, stated in terms reminiscent of Kant, is, How is the ethical person possible? Owing to the interdependence of all ethical conceptions, Professor Hudson feels justified in looking at the subject from a restricted aspect. What is the nature of a free person? If we go no further than the domain of natural science, no such person can exist; science denies autonomy to persons. But Kant, so we are reminded with interesting conviction, has demonstrated that science itself presupposes the *a priori* knower. Whatever else may be said of an ethical person, he is essentially the *a priori* knower. The primè object of this study is to show that any attempt to establish any other theory of personality ends in self-refutation. The particular attempt considered is English empiricism. To let the author speak for himself:

"To summarize in one sentence, our threefold task is: to present the treatment of personality by Locke, Berkeley and Hume, especially with reference to the place of the *a priori* in that treatment, with the subsidiary aim of showing by a sort of illustrative dialectic, in each case and together, the necessity of the *a priori* for any personality such as they tried to guarantee, and such as is adequate for ethics. Thus our aim is plainly a restricted one. The working out of a total ethics or metaphysics is the least of the intention. The most that can be essayed is to indicate one logical condition which such a total view must observe—the logical condition of rational self-activity, in the sense of *a priori* cognition."

While Locke is interested primarily in the limitation of human knowledge, he has much to say in regard to personality. He is intuitively certain of his own existence, but this certainty is not for him what it was for Descartes, a logical first principle. Though the implication of his treatment may not always uphold it, the essay is pervaded with dualistic